

---

## PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE

### Section 1. General administrative information

#### Title of project

Focus Watershed Coordination-Flathead River Watershed

---

**BPA project number:** 9608701

**Contract renewal date (mm/yyyy):** 3/1999 ☒ **Multiple actions?**

#### Business name of agency, institution or organization requesting funding

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes

---

**Business acronym (if appropriate)** CSKT

#### Proposal contact person or principal investigator:

**Name** Lynn S. Ducharme

**Mailing Address** PO Box 278

**City, ST Zip** Pablo, MT 59855

**Phone** 406-675-2700

**Fax** 406-675-2739

**Email address** \_\_\_\_\_

#### NPPC Program Measure Number(s) which this project addresses

7.7 A & B pages 7-40 through 7-43, 10.1B, 10.2A.2, 10.2B, 10.2C.1, 10.2C.2, 10.2C.4, 10.2C.5, 10.3A and 10.3D.

---

#### FWS/NMFS Biological Opinion Number(s) which this project addresses

Bull Trout ESA Listing (63 FR 31647)

Westslope Cutthroat Trout (Petitioned for ESA Listing (63 FR 31691))

---

#### Other planning document references

Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation Plan (Approved by NPPC) (1991)

Hungry Horse Fisheries Implementation Plan (Approved by NPPC)(1993)

Middle Clark Fork River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report

Flathead River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report

South Fork Flathead River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report

Swan River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report

South Fork of the Flathead River Conservation Agreement

Kerr Mitigation Plan/FERC Relicensing documents

Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes Tribal Fisheries Management Plan (1993)

Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes Draft Forest Management Plan (1996)

Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes Comprehensive Resource Plan (1996)

---

Demographic and Habitat Requirements for Conservation of Bull Trout (1993)  
The Relationship Between Land Management Activities and Habitat Requirements of  
Bull Trout (1998)  
See Section 6, References

---

### Short description

This program fosters “grass roots” public involvement, interagency cooperation and cooperative cost-sharing for habitat restoration to offset impacts to fishery resources in the Flathead watershed.

---

### Target species

Bull trout, westslope cutthroat and all other species residing within the Flathead River drainage.

---

## Section 2. Sorting and evaluation

### Subbasin

Upper Columbia Subregion, Flathead Subbasin

---

### Evaluation Process Sort

CBFWA caucus	Special evaluation process	ISRP project type
Mark one or more caucus	If your project fits either of these processes, mark one or both	Mark one or more categories
<input type="checkbox"/> Anadromous fish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident fish <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multi-year (milestone-based evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Watershed project evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Watershed councils/model watersheds <input type="checkbox"/> Information dissemination <input type="checkbox"/> Operation & maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> New construction <input type="checkbox"/> Research & monitoring <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation & management <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife habitat acquisitions

## Section 3. Relationships to other Bonneville projects

***Umbrella / sub-proposal relationships.*** List umbrella project first.

Project #	Project title/description

***Other dependent or critically-related projects***

<b>Project #</b>	<b>Project title/description</b>	<b>Nature of relationship</b>
9101903	Flathead Watershed Restoration and Monitoring	Implements mitigation plan
9101904	Non-native fish removal/Hatchery Production	Native/Non-native species interaction research; Offsite mitigation for Flathead Lake
9101901	Flathead Lake Monitoring and Habitat Enhancement	Habitat restoration and monitoring.
9410002	Flathead River Native Species Project	Native/Non-native species interaction research in the Flathead River
9520500	Flathead River Instream Flow Project	Instream habitat restoration

**Section 4. Objectives, tasks and schedules**

***Past accomplishments***

<b>Year</b>	<b>Accomplishment</b>	<b>Met biological objectives?</b>
1998	Published Dayton Creek Watershed Restoration Progress Report	N/A
1998	Contributed cost-share to Small Landowner workshop sponsored by Montana DNRC.	N/A
1998	Contributed cost-share to FBC, Voluntary Monitoring Program. Other contributors include Montana Watercourse.	N/A
1998	Revised grazing plan, built riparian and headwater fence in East Valley Creek.	To be determined-Fence excluded cattle from headwaters. Benefits will be long term through wetland and riparian recovery
1998	Contributed cost-share (along with NRCS, USFWS, Pheasants Forever, Montana Watershed Inc. landowners, and Lake Co. Conservation District in Valley View to exclude stock from two irrigation canals/creeks entering Flathead River.	To be determined-Fence excluded cattle. Benefits will be long term through irrigation tailwater improvements in terms of water quality.
1998	Received cost-share grant from Fish America Foundation for road obliteration in Valley Creek drainage. This matched federal Jobs in the Woods monies and	To be determined-Benefits will be long term in terms of sedimentation reduction associated with the road's proximity to the creek.

	Salish-Kootenai College equipment time.	
1998		
1998	Received challenge grant from Bring Back the Natives for on-the-ground work in Valley Creek or Jocko River drainage.	Money has not been spent at this time.

### ***Objectives and tasks***

<b>Obj 1,2,3</b>	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Task a,b,c</b>	<b>Task</b>
1	Identify watershed entities	a	The known watershed entities have been identified but this task will be ongoing as new groups and individuals become organized.
		b	Determine the extent to which these groups or individuals can be involved (ongoing as above).
2	Enhance communication network	a	Consult with other agencies and individuals to coordinate efforts thereby avoiding duplication and increasing efficiency. This will also be ongoing throughout the project.
3	Establish watershed forums in DuCharme Creek, Little Bitterroot River, Dayton, Post Creek, and the Jocko River.	a	Facilitate the forming of local citizens working groups and provide professional expertise and resources necessary for the working group to create an implementable watershed plan
		b	Provide for the involvement of volunteers, landowners and educational institutions in the implementation of projects.
4	Evaluate the condition of the watershed and identify limiting factors (not field related as per this project).	a	Utilize on-site analytical techniques as well as information within the watershed assessment (to be completed in FY99) to identify and address limiting factors
		b	Identify gaps in knowledge which hamper management decisions and give rise to future research and data collection needs.
		c	Identify time frames and prioritization scheme to address limiting factors
5	Coordinate cooperative	a	Provide coordination to facilitate

	implementation and funding		watershed based fish and wildlife habitat improvement plans and projects.
		b	Identify potential federal, state, tribal and private funding sources for implementation of watershed based projects.
		c	Provide assistance to agencies, private groups and local citizens to find cooperative funding for habitat improvement projects.
		d	Establish a technical advisory committee as each subwatershed is addressed from governmental and tribal agencies and private consultants.
6	Establish watershed monitoring and evaluation	a	Coordinate between CSKT, MFWP, Flathead Basin Commission, and Uof M's Yellow Bay research station and other agencies to establish TMDLs and a drainage wide water quality inventory.
7	Transfer information	a	Produce a model watershed plan that will be used by conservation districts, watershed groups, communities and agencies in the future as a guide for watershed planning, funding, and resource management.
8	Local and regional coordination	a	Contact BPA and NWPPC Planning staffs as often as needed, but no less than once per quarter to keep them abreast of the progress in the planning and implementation process.
		b	Coordinate with NRCS, USDA, MFWP, Conservation Districts and others to assure cooperative planning and implementation of watershed planning.
9	Implement temporary and permanent easements and long-term management agreements in key subbasins to protect investments in habitat improvements.	a	Work with landowners and federal, state, tribal agencies to create easements and long-term management plans for long term species and habitat protection.

### ***Objective schedules and costs***

<b>Obj #</b>	<b>Start date mm/yyyy</b>	<b>End date mm/yyyy</b>	<b>Measureable biological objective(s)</b>	<b>Milestone</b>	<b>FY2000 Cost %</b>
1	05/1997	3/2007	N/A	Ongoing	1.00%
2	5/1997	3/2007	N/A	Ongoing	3.00%
3	07/1997	3/2001	N/A	Ongoing	30.00%
4	2/2000	3/2007	N/A	Completed watershed assessment	30.00%
5	5/1997	3/2007	No direct biological objective. Objectives defined on a project specific basis.	Ongoing	25.00%
6	1/1999	3/2007	No direct biological objective. Objectives defined on a project specific basis.	Ongoing as projects are implemented in sub-watersheds	5.00%
7	1/2000	2/2001	NA	Completion of Focus Watershed Plan	2.00%
8	5/1997	3/2007	N/A	Ongoing	2.00%
9	1/1999	3/2007	No direct biological objective. Objectives defined on a project specific basis.	Ongoing	2.00%
				<b>Total</b>	100.00%

### **Schedule constraints**

Permitting, public scoping, interagency coordination, and cost-share funding opportunities all introduce uncertainty into the timing of project implementation. Moving with several projects simultaneously ensures a continuous string of ongoing projects.

### **Completion date**

At this stage, funding is proposed to continue through the year 2007. However, it is too early in project to predict an exact completion date due to the potential schedule constraints listed above and the size and complexity of the drainage.

## **Section 5. Budget**

**FY99 project budget (BPA obligated):**     \$100,000

***FY2000 budget by line item***

<b>Item</b>	<b>Note</b>	<b>% of total</b>	<b>FY2000</b>
Personnel		%35	35,781
Fringe benefits		%7	7,400
Supplies, materials, non-expendable property		%1	719
Operations & maintenance		%9	9,100
Capital acquisitions or improvements (e.g. land, buildings, major equip.)		%0	
NEPA costs		%0	
Construction-related support		%0	
PIT tags	# of tags:	%0	
Travel		%2	2,500
Indirect costs		%17	17,000
Subcontractor		%0	
Other	Implementation dollars	%30	30,500
<b>TOTAL BPA FY2000 BUDGET REQUEST</b>			<b>\$103,000</b>

***Cost sharing***

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Item or service provided</b>	<b>% total project cost (incl. BPA)</b>	<b>Amount (\$)</b>
NRCS	On-the-ground cost share	%0	
USFWS	On-the-ground cost share	%0	
CSKT	On-the-ground cost share	%0	
MFWP	On-the-ground cost share	%0	
BOR	On-the-ground cost share	%16	20,000
<b>Total project cost (including BPA portion)</b>			<b>\$123,000</b>

***Outyear costs***

	<b>FY2001</b>	<b>FY02</b>	<b>FY03</b>	<b>FY04</b>
<b>Total budget</b>	\$106,100	\$109,300	\$112,500	115,900

**Section 6. References**

<b>Watershed?</b>	<b>Reference</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Asotin County Conservation District Landowner Steering Committee. 1995. Asotin Creek Model Watershed Plan, Asotin County, Washington. Report to Asotin County Conservation District, Asotin County.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT). 1985. Aquatic Lands Conservation Ordinance 87A. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. Pablo, Montana.
<input type="checkbox"/>	CSKT. 1990. Water Quality Management Ordinance 89B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Pablo, Montana.
<input type="checkbox"/>	CSKT. 1995. Proposed Rules--Surface Water Quality Standards and Antidegradation Policy. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Pablo, Montana. 45 pp.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CSKT. 1996. Flathead Reservation Comprehensive Resources Plan Volume I. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. Pablo, Montana.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CSKT. 1996. Flathead Reservation Comprehensive Resources Plan Volume II. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. Pablo, Montana.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CSKT. 1996. Flathead Indian Reservation Draft Forest Management Plan. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. Pablo, Montana.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DosSantos, J.M., C., Hunter, L. Lockard, B. Marotz and J. Vashro. 1992. Hungry Horse Dam Fisheries Mitigation Implementation Plan. Report to the Northwest Power Planning Council, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Kalispell, and the Confederated Sa
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program Board of Directors. 1994. Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program. Operations-Action Plan. LaGrande, Oregon.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Idaho Soil Conservation Commission. 1995. Model Watershed Plan. Lemhi, Pahsimeroi, and East Fork of the Salmon River. Report to Bonneville Power Administration.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Idaho Soil Conservation Commission. 1995. Model Watershed Plan. Lemhi, Pahsimeroi, and East Fork of the Salmon River. Report to Bonneville Power Administration.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Knotek, W. L., M. Delaray and B. Marotz. 1997. Hungry Horse Dam Fisheries Mitigation Program--Fish Passage and Habitat Improvement in the Upper Flathead River Basin. Report to Bonneville Power Administration. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Kalispel
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Montana Bull Trout Scientific Group (MBTSG). 1996. Middle Clark Fork River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report. The Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team, Helena, Montana. 37 pp.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MBTSG. 1995. Flathead River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report. The Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team, Helena, Montana. 46 pp.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MBTSG. 1995. South Fork Flathead River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report. The Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team, Helena, Montana. 33 pp.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MBTSG. 1997. Swan River Drainage Bull Trout Status Report. The Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team, Helena, Montana. 42 pp.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MBTSG. 1998. The Relationship Between Land Management Activities and Habitat Requirments of Bull Trout. The Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team, Helena, Montana. 78 pp.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rieman, B.E. and J.D. McIntyre. 1993. Demographic Habitat Requirements for Conservation of Bull Trout. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Ogden, Utah. 37pp.



<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Fisheries Program. 1993. Fisheries Management Plan for the Flathead Indian Reservation. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Pablo, Montana. 65 pp.
-------------------------------------	--

## **PART II - NARRATIVE**

### **Section 7. Abstract**

This program specifically fulfills the watershed approach and watershed coordination specified in sections 7.7A and B pages 7-40 through 7-43 and 10.1B, 10.2A.2, 10.2B, 10.2C.1, 10.2C.2, 10.2C.4, 10.2C.5, 10.3A and 10.3D in the 1994 Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. This program also complements ongoing BPA programs (Section 8).

The Flathead Drainage in Montana has experienced a severe decline in the range and number of two native trout species (bull trout, westslope cutthroat trout). Bull trout were recently listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act and westslope cutthroat have been petitioned for listing. A balanced system-wide watershed approach to achieve ecosystem equity is necessary to reverse the downward trends in native species and protect those remaining healthy populations within the Flathead River watershed.

This program fosters “grass roots” public involvement and interagency cooperation to achieve watershed restoration both efficiently and cost effectively. This program and the watershed coordinator promote Local Focus Watershed plans which have the best chance to be implemented successfully and are likely to be the most cost-effective long term alternatives for native species recovery. Initial priorities of this project are focusing on direct tributaries to Flathead Lake and the lower Flathead River drainage as a momentum in the upper Flathead is established (see project 9101903) and there is no need to disrupt the status quo at this time. However, this project does realize that the north end is an integral part of the Flathead system and will participate as needed. Since both bull and westslope cutthroat trout can be international and interstate in nature, long term persistence will require local, interstate and international cooperation and coordination.

It is therefore important to fully fund the Flathead Model Watershed Project for FY00 through the completion of the project.

### **Section 8. Project description**

#### **a. Technical and/or scientific background**

Currently, the Flathead watershed (6 million acres) has been radically altered by hydropower development and operations and other land uses. With the construction of Hungry Horse, Bigfork and Kerr dams, the Flathead River system has been divided into isolated populations. In the drainage, bull trout have been listed as threatened species and cutthroat trout are expected to be listed shortly. The effects of existing conditions are

evident when observing the reduction in the current distribution of native fish species in comparison to their historic range (see attached bibliography for publications relating to the condition of the watershed). Many streams in the drainage are experiencing degraded habitat conditions due to the increase in sediment, temperature, and introduced species and the reduction in channel diversity and riparian vegetation. Past legal and illegal species introductions are causing problems for the remaining ecosystems. This project fosters in-kind, out of place mitigation in order to offset the impacts of hydropower development and resulting inundation to 72 miles of the South Fork of the Flathead River and its tributaries upstream of Hungry Horse Dam.

Although bull trout populations appear to be stable in both Hungry Horse Reservoir and Swan Lake, the threat of development and the construction of new roads and increased timber harvest places all populations within the Flathead watershed at risk where we are focusing our efforts. Coordination between Montana and British Columbia will be essential for the persistence of bull trout in the North Fork Flathead River drainage.

Key subbasins within the Flathead drainage, which are critical to native species restoration, are experiencing a rapidly progressing change in land ownership and management patterns. Subdivision and residential development of agricultural and timber lands adjacent to waterways in the drainage poses one of the greatest threats to weak but recoverable stocks of trout species. Plum Creek Timber Company, a major landholder in the Flathead drainage is currently divesting itself of large tracks of its lakeshore and streamside holdings basin-wide. Growth of small tract development throughout the area and its tributaries is occurring at a record rate. Immediate to short-term action is required to protect stream and riparian corridors through many of these areas if cost-effective recovery efforts are to be implemented.

For more information pertaining to scientific background warranting funding of this project, please refer to the Flathead River Watershed and Physical Parameter Review submitted in the FY99 proposal for this project.

In order to properly address the issues mentioned above, other segments of society and other (non-BPA) funding sources must be incorporated into the solution. As stated in the 1994 Fish and Wildlife Program (section 7.7), "Comprehensive watershed management should enhance and expedite implementation of actions by clearly identifying gaps in programs and knowledge, by striving over time to resolve conflicts, and by keying on activities that address priorities." A watershed coordinator helps to initiate and facilitate efforts for addressing the issues mentioned above and pulling together plans for mitigation. If recovery of the fisheries resources is to be successful in the drainage, locally lead recovery plans are going to provide the greatest chance for success. Without local support it is unlikely that local governments and individual citizens are going to allow government initiatives to be implemented.

## **b. Rationale and significance to Regional Programs**

As stated above, this project complements other projects such as the Flathead river Native Species Project (project 9401002), Flathead Watershed Restoration and Monitoring (9101903), Flathead Lake Monitoring and Habitat Enhancement (9101901), Non-native Fish Removal/Hatchery Production (9101904), Flathead River Instream Flow Project. The Flathead River Focus Watershed program also complements its sister project in the Kootenai River system (9608702). The Flathead watershed coordination project is supported by the Flathead Basin Commission (FBC), Lake, Lincoln, Sanders, and Flathead County Conservation Districts, the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), Citizens for a Scenic Lake County and the University of Montana (UM) Yellow Bay Biological Station. Activities are being coordinated with these agencies/groups to implement plans and projects in the future. All of these activities further the Fish and Wildlife Program goals of habitat restoration from a coordinated, watershed perspective.

**c. Relationships to other projects**

The Flathead Focus Watershed program plays a crucial role in directly integrating the other four Hungry Horse mitigation projects (9101901, 9101904, 9101903, 9401002, 9502500). The Flathead Focus Watershed program also uses its resources toward cooperative and collaborative watershed protection and restoration with the US Forest Service (USFS), Lake, Lincoln, Sanders, and Flathead County Conservation Districts, NRCS, Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (MFWP), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), FBC, UM Yellow Bay Biological Station as well as private citizens and interest groups.

The Flathead River Focus Watershed Coordinator will also be exchanging information with its sister project, the Kootenai Focus Watershed Coordinator. Through sharing information, both projects will benefit from each others' successes and failures.

**d. Project history (for ongoing projects)**

This project began in May of 1997. Since its birth, Watershed Program has begun coordinating and assisting in several local projects including Dayton Creek, east and south forks of Valley Creek, Valley View, Little Bitterroot River, DuCharme Creek, Post Creek, Marsh Creek and the Jocko River. The watershed coordinator has worked closely with the FBC; the Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team; Lake, Lincoln, Sanders, and Flathead County Conservation Districts; NRCS personnel, CSKT personnel, and several locally lead community interest groups. These relations have increased communication, allowed the coordinator to become more familiar with the issues at hand, and promoted coordinated efforts increasing efficiency and avoiding duplication.

The Dayton Creek Watershed Restoration Progress Report was distributed in November of 1998. A Flathead River watershed assessment is currently being organized.

**e. Proposal objectives**

This project will result in a coordinated effort toward addressing resource concerns within the Flathead River basin from a watershed perspective. Pilot projects initiated under this project will help guide the plan for fisheries and wildlife losses caused by Hungry Horse Dam construction and operation. This project will also include on-the-ground habitat improvement and protection measures toward the same goal.

The watershed coordinator will continually search for cost share funding opportunities and review new research studies relating to the condition of the Flathead River watershed. Through working with other agencies and landowners and utilizing existing information (e.g. Hungry Horse Mitigation and Implementation Plan, Montana Bull Trout Scientific Group Status Reports, CSKT Comprehensive Resource Plan, and other documents found in the Flathead River Watershed and Physical Parameter Review), key limiting factors will be identified for native fish and wildlife within the drainage. Limiting factors will be identified and addressed for each subbasin. Subbasins will then be prioritized according to their recovery potential for each major species. Locally based watershed working groups will then be initiated and recovery strategies formulated and implemented. Easements and long term management plans will ensure that our efforts are long lasting. Other assurances that our efforts will be long lasting are CSKT ordinances such as the Aquatic Lands Conservation Ordinance, CSKT Streamside Ordinance, CSKT Tribal Forestry Best Management Practices, and CSKT Water Quality Ordinance. Improved biological production and increased fish growth potential in the tributaries, rivers and closed basin lakes and ponds are an expected outcome of these efforts.

BPA seed money for project implementation received during FY98 began implementation and set the stage for continuing on-the-ground work in both Valley and Dayton Creeks in FY99 and beyond. As these projects continue, they will require more coordination and implementation as more cost sharing opportunities and projects become available in the coming years. BPA and cost-share funding for Dayton Creek will potentially work in conjunction with money from the Natural Resource Conservation Service's EQIP.

Dayton Creek historically provided spawning and rearing habitat for bull and cutthroat trout that lived part of their life cycle in Flathead Lake. Numerous changes in the Dayton Creek channel and drainage basin have resulted in a shift in species residing in the creek and an overall reduction in carrying capacity of the creek. The fisheries branches of the Tribal and State governments wish to restore Dayton Creek to its historic carrying capacity and to re-establish adfluvial spawning runs of native cutthroat trout from Flathead Lake.

Valley Creek is part of the tributary complex of the Jocko River drainage which enters the lower Flathead River near Dixon, Montana. The Jocko River was recently designated as a core area needing stringent protection by the Montana Bull Trout Restoration Team. The Jocko River and Valley Creek also support westslope cutthroat trout which are a petitioned species. Valley Creek also provides habitat for elk, whitetail deer, black bear, ruffed grouse and Neotropical migrant passerines. Valley Creek has been impaired by season long livestock grazing resulting in an over-widened channel and loss of habitat.

Other potential project areas include the Jocko River drainage, DuCharme Creek and the Little Bitterroot River. The Jocko has been designated a core area for bull trout by the Montana Bull Trout Scientific Team. Problems in the Jocko include temperature, sedimentation, channelization, and loss of its historic floodplain. DuCharme Creek is a tributary to the south end of Flathead Lake. DuCharme Creek is experiencing flooding and loss of a distinct channel due to increasing sedimentation possibly related to grazing and other land management practices. The Little Bitterroot has recently undergone a change from a distinct river and floodplain area to a less functional extensive canary grass and cattail wetland. Reasons for this change may include instream flows, irrigation practices, and lack of a natural hydrograph (Hubbart Dam).

The above projects will help to improve habitat for bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout which are native species to the area. Severely degraded riparian and bank conditions have reduced stream habitat and water quality over time making streams unavailable for spawning or migration. Improved riparian and wetland conditions will also benefit many species of wildlife.

A Model Watershed Plan will result from the efforts of this program. This plan will provide background, identify limiting factors, areas of priority and concern, resource issues, etc. within the Flathead River basin and implementation strategies to address each limiting factor. The watershed plan will not be completed (but will have just begun) during the FY2000 work year due to the extensive amount of new and existing information and input the plan will incorporate. The plan will be an umbrella document encompassing existing and ongoing information from the FBC, county and state offices, Hungry Horse Mitigation, Kerr Dam Mitigation, the UM's Yellow Bay Biological Station, Conservation Districts, and CSKT (see references & above paragraph). Throughout the course of putting together the Model Watershed Plan, the above groups will be consulted and intrinsically involved in the formation, structure and content of the plan as well. Public scoping will be conducted by approaching existing public groups and private landowners to solicit their input into the plan.

For more specific proposal objectives, see Section 4, Objectives, Tasks, and Schedules.

#### **f. Methods**

This program fosters “grass roots” public involvement to achieve the goal of habitat restoration. We will incorporate the principles of consensus, collaborative effort, and interagency cooperation. Public scoping will be conducted by approaching existing public groups and private landowners to assess their needs and soliciting cooperation. One-on-one interviews will be used to obtain candid insights. Given the unique stakeholders and personal dynamics of each subbasin within the Flathead drainage, it seems unlikely that a single uniform approach to establishing local watershed groups is going to be successful. Local watershed plans are going to have to be dynamic to meet the needs of local communities as well as promote the persistence of target fish and wildlife species. The Model Watershed Plan for the Lemhi, Pahsimeroi and East Fork of

the Salmon River (Idaho Soil Conservation Commission 1995) and the Grande Ronde will be used as templates for process but it is expected that significant deviation will occur according to differing resource needs of the Flathead drainage.

Restoration activities will be based upon the latest and best available science. Activities will be approached in an effort to restore conditions to as close to pristine conditions as possible. When “heavy handed” restoration activities are necessary, work will always be based upon the best available science (e.g. natural channel design techniques as promoted by Dave Rosgen).

When on-the-ground projects are implemented, pre-and post-treatment surveys will be used to compare various habitat restoration, passage improvement and offsite mitigation efforts. Photo points measure the success of revegetation and bank stabilization projects. Habitat surveys quantify shifts in cover, pool-riffle run ratio and substrate conditions. Population assessments compare species relative abundance, population structure, and survival recruitment. Redd surveys estimate adult spawning population and describe habitat requirements. Migration counts compare strength of spawner populations. Please refer to related projects 9101903 (Hungry Horse Mitigation/Habitat Improvements), 9101901 (Hungry Horse Fisheries Mitigation) and the CSKT Tribal Fisheries Management Plan for a more detailed explanation of monitoring protocols.

Other useful information for monitoring purposes includes work currently in progress by the FBC, University of Montana Yellow Bay Biological Station, and CSKT. This includes water quality monitoring conducted by the FBC as well as work conducted in conjunction with MFWP through FBC’s Volunteer Monitor Program. UM Yellow Bay Biological Station conducts water quality analyses at their mid-lake station of Flathead Lake. CSKT has a Water Quality Program which closely keeps track of water quality within the Reservation’s boundaries (southern half of Flathead Lake and the lower Flathead River basin. The CSKT program also monitors fine sediment levels and the presence/absence of aquatic invertebrates to monitor lake, stream and river health. All of this information will be utilized to identify trends, improvements or declines in watershed health. This information can also be used to identify the need to adapt management practices and/or the need to conduct new research or adapt current studies to better assess watershed health.

#### **g. Facilities and equipment**

The CSKT complex contains several buildings containing office space, computer equipment, and vehicle compounds sufficient for project staff. This project works closely with those projects mentioned above in Section 7c making SCUBA and snorkel gear, electrofishing equipment, GPS equipment, and sampling/monitoring equipment available from these other programs. These resources will be utilized when deemed necessary.

#### **h. Budget**

The personnel component of the budget encompasses salary and merit and cost of living increases for one full time employee, the focus watershed coordinator. Fringe benefits include health benefits, unemployment, social security, life insurance, retirement, and workman's compensation. The supplies and materials line item includes items such as office supplies. Operations and maintenance items includes postage, copying charges, telephone expenses, vehicle rental, use and insurance, printing, etc. Implementation dollars encompass seed monies used in cost share for project implementation. These monies will be used in areas such as Dayon, Jocko River, Valley Creek and DuCharme Creek.

## **Section 9. Key personnel**

The Flathead River Focus Watershed program is staffed by Lynn S. DuCharme. Prior to this position, Lynn worked as a soil consultant for EcoSystem Management as a soil scientist and for Gallatin County Health Department as an Environmental Health Specialist. Prior to the health department, she worked for Soil Services Company, Inc. as a soil consultant. She completed her Masters degree in Soil Science at Montana State University in May of 1994. Lynn worked part time while getting her B.S. degree in Environmental Science (Stockton State University, Pomona, N.J.) for Environmental Information Services performing wetland delineations and other environmental assessments. All of these employment positions and educational opportunities provided a diverse array of environmental background as well as helped strengthened Lynn's people and communication skills. Her educational background provides a strong base for this position with a wide array of course work and projects in the environmental studies area.

## **Section 10. Information/technology transfer**

One of the primary goals of this program is to produce a cooperative watershed plan with input from various federal, state and local agencies as well as private landowners and stakeholders. This document will be available for reference and information to all local and regional interests. Currently, cooperative opportunities exist between BPA, BOR, Army Corps, USFS, MFWP, NRCS, State, County and other Tribal programs, Counties, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Sporting and Conservation Groups, and British Columbia, Canada. Also, the Flathead Basin Commission, Flathead River Network, and the Lake County working group have shown great interest in cooperative work toward watershed restoration, education, workshops, etc.

## **Congratulations!**